

**From:** [Moore, Gary](#)  
**To:** ["Mickey Edmondson"](#)  
**Subject:** CES: Stone Machinery Movers (DRAFT)  
**Date:** Saturday, May 23, 2015 2:03:00 AM

---

Mickey - See what I put together below to send to Steve Shurn. We can talk about it next week. Mr. Stone came by late Friday afternoon with two (2) associates. I gave them a tour of the Main Warehouse Building and discussed his approval by the court to remove the Warehouse and the Shed. As I was talking with him, I mentioned that we would need to discuss actions he would need to take to prevent his activities from creating runoff from the building into storm drains and what exactly his plans were to remove the buildings I will need to do a little research but it is my understanding that even though the property was erected after 1978, an asbestos inspection must be performed (not sure but will check). Anyway, I know for sure that he has to give 10 working day notice of any demo work to Texas Department of State Health Services prior to the demo. I do have some concerns about the mechanics of the demo of the building.

1. There are structures located within the building.
  - a. Two (2) story office/lab area stuffed with debris/trash – Will this office/lab area be demoed when the structure is removed? Who will disposed of it? Who will pay for the disposal? Who will pay for the disposal of the trash/debris?
  - b. Cinderblock wall (Floor to Ceiling) between separate areas of the structure – Same questions as in a. above
  - c. Wastewater Treatment Tanks and Piping on the North Area of the Warehouse – It was my understanding that when this was proposed that Stone Machinery would be removing the tanks and piping and placing them on plastic and covering them with plastic. It did not get this impression from Mr. Stone.
  - d. Trenches, Sumps, and Secondary Containment structures – Although these have been cleaned to some degree, there still may be solids that could be travel towards the storm drains we rainfall falls on the slab of the building. It may be worse if the piping and tanks are left in place.
  - e. Interior Insulation on the Roof – It did not appear that Mr. Stone was interested in the interior of roof insulation and indicated that it would be placed into a roll-off for someone else to dispose. Who is that someone else?
  - f. Piping connected to the roof – This is really just debris that would need to be disposed.
  - g. Piping/Miscellaneous debris along the back wall - This is piping that was removed from trenches and the wastewater treatment area – This material is currently fine where it is located as long as the building is still standing but when it is taken down this material would have to be placed on plastic and covered with plastic until recycled or disposed.
  - h. Sediment control (hay bales or the like) would need to be in place for storm water following on the slab and draining towards the storm drains.
  - i. Shed Building has a floor drain sump and a drum/tote was area with a sump. EPA cleaned both of these sumps but after the demo these sumps will collect rainwater that will overflow. This should not be a big deal except that one should place oil absorbent boom around these areas until it is confirmed that no oil sheens will be noticed as they fill up and overflow towards the storm drains.

It appears that this action did not incorporate a demolition plan that considered who would address

what in the demo of the building. It would be unacceptable to demo this building without addressing the items listed above. It is not necessary that Mr. Stone address these but either Mr. Stone or the Trustee should be addressing these since this is an action that the Trustee got approved through the court. It is my understanding that the Trustee does not have the money to address these issues so who would be addressing them if Mr. Stone did not address these.

Thanks

**Gary Moore**

**Federal On-Scene Coordinator**

**U.S. EPA Region 6**

**214-789-1627 cell**

**214-665-6609 office**

[moore.gary@epa.gov](mailto:moore.gary@epa.gov)